Case 1:14-cv-08678-CM Document 65 Filed 01/23/15 Page 1 of 11

F1cqvic 1 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK 2 3 GUALBERTO VICTORIO, PASCUAL ROJAS, DANY CERNA, FRANCISCO 4 CORTEZ, JUAN SALAS, RODRIGO GARCIA, LAZARO ROMANO, 5 IDELFONSO GIL RODRIGUEZ, KEITH QUINONEZ and SELVIN MENDEZ VELIZ, and other similarly 6 situated current and former 7 bussers, food runners, prep cooks and dishwashers employed by Defendants, 8 PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION ORDER 9 Plaintiffs, ON CONSENT 10 14 CV 8678 (CM) (AJP) v. 11 SAMMY'S FISHBOX REALTY, CO., LLC, BRIDGE STREET RESTAURANT CORP., CITY ISLAND SEAFOOD CO. 12 INC., FISHBOX RESTAURANT 13 CORPORATION, SEA SHORE RESTAURANT CORP., LOBSTER 14 HOUSE REALTY CO. LLC, CRAB SHANTY REALTY CO., LLC and 15 SAMUEL CHERNIN and JOHN ARMINIO individually, 16 Defendants. 17 ----x 18 New York, N.Y. January 12, 2015 9:40 a.m. 19 20 Before: 21 HON. ANDREW J. PECK, 22 Magistrate Judge 23 24 25

	FICGVIC
1	
2	APPEARANCES
3	VINCENT BAUER Attorney for Plaintiffs Gualberto Victorio, et al.
5	-and- JACOB ARONAUER
6	Attorney for Plaintiffs
7	MILMAN LABUDA LAW GROUP, PLLC Attorneys for Defendants Sammy's Fishbox Realty, et al. JOSEPH M. LABUDA
8	EMANUEL KATAEV
9	ALSO PRESENT: CARLOS CRUZ, Spanish Interpreter SAMUEL CHERNIN, Defendant
10	JOHN ARMINIO, Defendant
11	
12	
13	
14 15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

1 (In open court)

THE COURT: We are on the record to record the agreed-upon preliminary injunction that the parties have agreed to following Judge McMahon's decision of December 12, 2014, docket number 34, and the Court's preliminary injunction hearing today.

The parties have agreed and the Court hereby enjoins defendants with respect to the Sea Shore Restaurant and the Sammy's Fishbox Restaurant as follows:

Defendants shall not engage in any retaliatory conduct or in any way retaliate against any plaintiff or potential plaintiff because of their status as a plaintiff or someone considering being a plaintiff in this lawsuit.

Specifically, and without limitation, defendants agree that they will not disproportionately reduce the number and length of shifts of the plaintiffs, that is, the scheduled shifts, as compared to nonplaintiff employees and based on prior schedules for the appropriate time of year that the plaintiffs individually have had in the past.

Defendants are further enjoined from in any way communicating, directly or indirectly, orally or in writing or in any other way to any employees about this lawsuit except as provided for with respect to the curative notice.

Defendants shall promptly post in the employee locker room in a prominent place in both restaurants, the Sea Shore

Restaurant and Sammy's Fishbox Restaurant, a curative notice to be drafted collectively by counsel for plaintiffs and defendants that shall provide that the employees are informed that retaliation against any employee for joining the lawsuit or staying in the lawsuit or anything else in connection with this lawsuit is strictly prohibited and that defendants will not in any way retaliate against such employees.

That notice will further provide that the new arbitration agreement in the December 2014 employee handbook and arbitration agreement does not apply to this lawsuit; including, it does not apply to employees who joined this lawsuit subsequent to their signing that arbitration agreement. In other words, whether they have signed the December 2014 arbitration agreement before becoming a plaintiff or after, it will have no application to this lawsuit.

As an aside, but this will not be in the notice, the issue about the prior 2008 previous arbitration agreements that is the subject of the motion to dismiss is not affected by this curative notice, so that's just to protect the defendants' rights.

The curative notice will further provide that in the event an employee has any issue or concern about the notice or the issues in the notice, they can contact plaintiffs' counsel. And the name of the lawyers, the firm, address, phone number, email address and fax number shall be provided on that curative

posting.

The parties agree that this preliminary injunction may be entered and that it will remain in effect unless modified by the Court pending the final conclusion of this lawsuit.

(Discussion off the record)

THE COURT: I may have misstated the name of the second restaurant. It is Sammy's Fishbox Restaurant, and the preliminary injunction should be understood as applying to that restaurant, as well as the Sea Shore Restaurant.

I direct both sides' counsel to promptly purchase the transcript at least of the separate transcript for the preliminary injunction. That is the form that the injunction will be filed with the Court in. It is obviously something that the defendants and their high-level personnel who are sitting here have heard, but it should be promptly communicated to any other managers or other personnel of the two restaurants who need to be so informed.

As to the curative notice, which counsel wants to take a first draft? And then I want to set a deadline for that and a deadline for its being submitted to the Court either as an approved notice or with counterpart notices, a plaintiff version and a defense version.

Mr. Bauer.

MR. BAUER: We can have one ready by tomorrow.

THE COURT: Can you have whatever further discussions

you need and have it to the Court by Thursday morning?

MR. LABUDA: How about Friday, your Honor?

THE COURT: Friday at 10:00 a.m.

In the event you have a disagreement on particular language rather than two conflicting notices where I've got to do, in essence, a red-line compare, can you have it with bracketed language, this is plaintiffs' version of this sentence, this is defendants' version and submit it in that form, unless you're submitting notices that are so wildly and widely apart that that makes no sense.

Now, where are you with Judge McMahon in terms of a scheduling order for discovery? Has one been entered yet?

MR. LABUDA: No, I don't think so. We have cross-motions going on right now, your Honor. We have a motion to dismiss. I think that's going to be fully briefed by February 3. And the plaintiffs have a cross-motion -- or have their own motion for a collective action, which is I think due on the same date.

MR. BAUER: Right, the same schedule.

THE COURT: I guess my question is, since the motion to dismiss is not that this case would be over but that it would be in arbitration where there is still discovery, is there any reason that at least document discovery, if not all discovery, should not go forward while those motions are being briefed and considered?

1	MR. LABUDA: I don't think there's a reason for the
2	document discovery. I take that back. As I sit here today,
3	I'm not sure exactly what the parameters are of the
4	arbitration.
5	THE COURT: Remind me even though we have just looked
6	at the documents, is it AAA?
7	MR. LABUDA: I think it's AAA.
8	THE COURT: AAA allows discovery. That's easy.
9	MR. BAUER: Perhaps, your Honor, a suggestion: We can
10	set a date for the service of Rule 26 initial disclosures.
11	THE COURT: Let's start with that. How soon can you
12	both do that?
13	MR. LABUDA: I can do that by Monday, that's fine.
14	THE COURT: By the 19th?
15	MR. BAUER: Okay.
16	THE COURT: Is there any reason that you can't start
17	document discovery? And by that, I guess, I mean Rule 33 and
18	Rule 34 requests for the existent plaintiffs simultaneously
19	with. That; and, therefore, we would have completion of that
20	discovery by, let's say, March 6.
21	MR. BAUER: I'm sorry. We're going to have the
22	initial document requests and we'll have you go out on the same
23	schedule as the 26 disclosures?

MR. BAUER: Okay.

25

THE COURT: Which means the response would be February 19, give or take.

MR. LABUDA: I misunderstood your Honor just in terms of the initial disclosures. So we're going to piggyback that with the document request and probably just ask for one more week because we're a bit jammed up.

THE COURT: Rule 26(a) disclosures by the 19th; that way you can look at each other's disclosures. And document requests and interrogatories to be served by no later than January 26. Let's set March 16 as the cutoff for that, and either Judge McMahon or I will deal with depositions thereafter if the case is still here.

MR. LABUDA: Are we just limited to document demands at this juncture? This is a AAA.

THE COURT: Interrogatories are useless in any event.

MR. LABUDA: I understand. It's almost meaningless.

THE COURT: I know, but if somebody has a legitimate interrogatory, which could be things like how many hours did the plaintiffs work or things like that, which will either be responded to by documents, I'm not foreclosing it. I don't care if you use it or not. As I say, most of the time, interrogatories are useless, but I don't want you to not do it now and then suddenly in March say, oh, now, I want to do interrogatories because the case is still here and then we can't do motions until 45 days after that to give people time

to answer the interrogatories. So if you're going to do it, do it; if you're not, don't do it. I don't care.

MR. LABUDA: Okay.

THE COURT: So, what we used to call paper discovery, meaning Rule 33 and Rule 34, even though we're now in the electronic age, is to be done so it's completed by March 16.

I also strongly suggest you all to start talking settlement. And if you want the Court's help, let me know, whether in referring you to the Southern District mediation program, whether it's a conference with me or some other judicial officer or whether you all do it on your own and/or decide to spend some money and go out to JAMS, NAM, etc., all of the usual providers.

The other question, I'm just going to put it out there and then leave you to talk about it amongst counsel: It appeared from the testimony of Mr. Arminio that the requirements of the federal rules on litigation may not have been appropriately communicated to the managerial employees of the defendants.

If you want to tell me anything about that now, you can, that it went to somebody else, not Mr. Arminio. I'm not trying to do anything about it now, other than to say if it hasn't been done and done the way the rules require, cure the problem sooner rather than later so it doesn't become a spoliation problem.

MR. LABUDA: Understood.

THE COURT: I leave it up to you whether you're going to buy the hearing transcript or not, but I'm certainly requiring both sides -- I've already told the reporter to do the preliminary injunction order transcript and the further discussion we have had on scheduling, but I'm requiring you all to order that.

I guess the final thing is, we have focused today entirely on the injunction-related issue. I have no opinion at this point about the merits of the case on either side, and it is my practice at first conferences to remind the parties that pursuant to 28 U.S.C. Section 636(c), if the parties wish to consent to have the case come over to my docket for the motions and/or the eventual trial, if there is going to be a case staying here, which there may or may not be, it requires unanimous consent. If one of you jumps up now and says I consent and the other doesn't consent, then there is no consent. No one gets brownie points or demerits, regardless of how you decide.

If you talk to your clients and talk to each other and you want the case to come over to my docket for either of the motions and/or for the entire case, you can sign the form.

There are copies of both a limited consent form, which is useful for motions, or the full consent form on the Court's website under my rules and, indeed, under each of the

magistrate judge's rules. Any questions? MR. BAUER: No, your Honor. MR. LABUDA: No, your Honor. THE COURT: Thank you for working out the language of the injunction. It would have been nice if we did it at 9:30 this morning instead of 5:00 at night, but so be it. With that, we are adjourned. MR. BAUER: Thank you. MR. LABUDA: Thank you. (Adjourned)